

II. PARTIAL TRAVERSE


Applicant does not traverse the requirement that claims 14-19 be prosecuted separately from claims 1-13. As the Examiner has correctly noted, claims 1-13 are directed to a machine that reads a coded label assembly and takes action in response to the information coded thereon, and claims 14-18 are directed to the coded label assembly itself.

Applicant, however, hereby traverses the remainder of the restriction requirement. Applicant points out that claims 19-24 are not directed to a label assembly as asserted by the Examiner as the basis for the restriction requirement. (Office Action, page 2) Rather, claims 19-21 and 24 are directed to a machine that reads the coded label assembly, just as with claims 1-13, and claims 22 and 23 are directed to the method by which that machine operates. Applicant therefore submits that claims 19-24 are properly classified in Group I along with claims 1-13. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the restriction requirement with respect to claims 19-24 be withdrawn, and that claims 1-13 and 19-24 proceed to examination.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The Examiner is kindly requested to call the undersigned if the Examiner believes that a telephone call would be helpful in moving this application forward to examination on the merits.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Joel D. Voelzke (Reg. No. 37,957)

Intellectual Property Law Office of Joel D. Voelzke
400 Corporate Pointe, Suite 300
Culver City, CA 90230
Telephone: (310) 590-4525
Facsimile: (310) 590-4526